Peter Skutches
Richard Gallen & Co.
260 Fifth Ave,
New York, NY 10001

7/6/93

Dear Peter,

From your 7/2, here today, we have no disagreeemnts. There are some external problems I ask that you keep in confidence ofter than with Richard on his return. I suppose much will then be stacked on his desk.

Richard is a dear, a cherished friend. I did not ask him for a contract and when he indicated he would be preparing one I told him I have no need of it. If he did not remember or did not tell you, when I told him a year ago what I would do and he indicated interest I then urged that there be something like a publisher'd foreword to explain why there was less editing than there could have been: because of my age and health; because for a number of non-ego reason I would much prefer to be alive when it appears and to be able to respond to any criticism, if any; to be available for what promotions are now within my capabilities; and because as long as I am able I want to continue to try to perfect the record for history. This plus what else could be said, for example the magnitude of my work and its scope, the unprecedented means by which I have done what I have done, etc.

All of this is true and it is also a natural promotion.

I also had in mind rushing it to the degree possible. It could have been out well before the flood of junk to commercialize and exploit the tragedy. While those who read, edit, review and report on books on this subject do not know what is real and possible and what is not, this book could have been a standard for those who review books. That I believed would make it more valuable, increase sales and benefit it if reponsible reviwers and reporters compared it with the others. Despite the time that has passed I believe something like it should be done. Can be, I think

With the passing of time with silence and then with silence in response to my inquiry I had become increasingly concerned. Several other factors figured in this. Like your being reassigned. However, I did not stop to think it all through. Then, when I did, old possible problems came to minfd. On the publisher, it think it best that not be C & G.

It was amonths after I mentioned my book to Richard before I knew Livingstone was doing another book for C & G. He had lied to me when he phoned asking for help. He then told me that he was working on a TV documentary with someone in New York. I do not remember that he ever did tell me he was working on a book, at least not until long after I knew it. Then when he told me what his book was going to say I found it hard to believe that such a book would be published.

Richard has some but far from all of his letters. I sent him only what I believed as C & G's counsel he should know. Whether or not what H.L. wrote is in the book, and if it is he has me as part of two conspiracies, helping the one he said killed and leading that

he imagined conspired to keep him from "breakibg the case wide open," as of last October.

However he may have misled others, if they are in fact misled, he is in fact rather much of a subject-matter ignoramus. For example, Kent Carroll's boast to PW that Harry knows what he talked about, witness the fact that it was he who brought the fact of JDK's adrenal deficiency to light. Were he not so ignorant of the actualities he would have known that my friend Dr. John Nichols published it 25 yrars ago and before that the LBJ gang used it over and over again in that campaign up to and at the convention in an effort to undercut JFK's lead.

The rest of what Carroll said has me and the others "killing the truth" and accessories after the fact in the assassination. The only "killing of truth" he can be talking about is his own books and writing and they are anything but the truth about the assassination or its investigations. If that is not laughed off the shelves C & G will be lucky.

Then there is the announced first print of 50,000+ This represents a not inconsiderable investment and forecasts a real effort to at the least recover it.

And my book, without mention of him (I have never mentioned him or his books in public or not in public for quotation) makes it clear that he doesn't know what he is talking about. I think that is understated.

So, would not C & G have a conflict, and does not the size of the first print indicate that with the conflict my book is certain to suffer?

When I learned that C & G were going to do Harry's book I wrote Richard asking if he could not copublish with someone else in Publishers West. But I did not send it because I thought it might be misunderstood as an intrusion. I believed that Richard copublished with C & G only. I am glad this is not the case. I do not know who the other PW publishers are, but I do believe that Thunder's Mouth may also have a cnflict, Mark Lane.

I hope Richard will make what arrangement on publishing he is going to make as soon as possible because another worry I had, believing that C & G would publish, is the missing of a natural and newsworthy promotion with regard to those Connally fragments. Once that matter came to a head, ordinarily a publisher would want something to use, exploit it with. When I heard nothing I wrote asked of a rough rough draft of an article. I also heard nothing of that. Once I sent it, to make it easier to read without the many typos my wife retyped it, in the event a magazine would have been interested in it.

I also sent a copy to a writer friend in New Zealand. A year or more ago a weekly editor he knows asked him to ask me to do an article. I then did not, but as soon as he saw this rough draft he took it to the editor and they are going to do with after cutting it to the size of New Zealand interest by eliminating what is not.

This is the kind of thing I mean by a natural promotion, in the news.

I also misinterpreted the silence, believing that Richard copublished with C & G only.

After I wrote him a short note of inquiry I did give all of this the thought I did not give it earlier in part because of new medical problems and in part from other need for

my time. What decided me to do what I began a week ago this past Sunday was what Kent Carroll told Pub. Weekly Harry's book says.

I had told Richard that I did not intend, absent a need, to say anything about it and that I did not want to spend any of the little time that remains to me in such things. That was true. It also has been my policy for years, not to get involved with all the shit-slingers. Then Lifton raised his corrupt head with some of his typical nastiness. I asked him to return what Livingstone's cop Waybright stole from me and sold to Lifton, the only c copy of my analysis of his hardback. When he refused I decided to replace that to the degree possible from memory and some citations from his book and his sources. Written

Putting all of this together and remembering that I am trying to serve history I decided to do a rough draft of what is tentatively titled Inside the JFK Assassination Industry.

The part I've largely drafted is accrediting myself, especially in the face of the existing attacks, Lifton's for example, and the coming one by the High Trash inventor.

This is another reason C & G ought not be first choice!

It is a record for history but it might be welcome after the flood of mutually-disproving assassination tripe of which I read in PW. Not a single one attacks, not one of them.

I've got the Lifton part done and it is absolutely devastating. With the interruptions I can expect this week I'll probably not finish Part 1, autobiographical but that only as an explanation of the learning experiences in jobs that are not exactly everyday and a few rather serious problems with very powerful enemies who were really determined. And I beat them. With what an education for it! What prepared me for what I have done. It is not taught.

Unless I'm told otherwise I'll not postpone the reading of Never Again until I see proofs, which I'll also have to read, so I can complete this new one.

Wrong has an epilogue and I have yet to do a bibliographical essay vice biography, which will be limited to my FOIA records and my previous work. Also the list of those FOIA lawsuits.

On the lengthy quotes, whichever way is faster is my preference now. I did misunderstand you on the footnote and I'll think of a formulation. However, I think it is also important that the reader not be under any misapprehension. In this field that would get much criticism and there are those anxious to criticize and in the past truth was no impediment to them.

I have no problem with interview by phone or, as has happened, if a satellite truck comes here. I do not know the nature of the ads or the space but again, because I must be abed early, my health and age should be indicated. It may turn some off but it also might interest some and make them wonder what kind of AK is that.

I do think there is hard news in the book that can be used for legitimate attention.

I do hope that Richard finds it possible to rush this all he can and that he will consider a publisher's note of foreword along the line I've indicated to explain any lack of editing and introduce the fact that an AK, albeit a bit battlescarred, did the book. And what i not a boast because there was no alternative, without any notes or outline. Thanks and best.

Harold